

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 15, 16, 24-27, and 32-34 are pending. The Final Action dated June 6, 2006 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that the amendments place this Application in condition for allowance and are therefore allowable as an "After Final" amendment. Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 have been amended in this Response. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 15-16, 24-27, and 32-34 have been cancelled in this Response. Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 have been determined by the Examiner to be in condition for the allowance. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner. Allowance of Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following.

Claims 3-4, 6-7, 11, 16, and 25 stand objected to as containing certain informalities. In light of the amendments submitted herewith, the Applicants submit that the objections have been rendered moot. Specifically, with regard to Claim 3, the Claim was objected to as reciting "...an integer multiple of 2..." As amended Claim 4 (which previously depended from Claim 3 and now contains the limitations of Claim 3) now reads "a multiple of 2."

Further, Claim 4 was objected to as reading "...the same state bits share the..." As amended Claim 4 now reads "...the same bits and share the..."

Additionally, Claim 6 was objected to as containing "...whether the an effective address..." Claim 6 as amended now recites "...whether an effective address..." Because of its dependency from Claim 6, Claim 7 was also objected too. Since the objection to Claim 6 has been overcome, the Applicants submit that the objection to dependent Claim 7 has also been overcome.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that the objections with regard to Claims 3-4 and 6-7 have been overcome and request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the invention. Specifically, with respect to Claim 6, the specification assertedly does not explicitly support wherein the remaining one of the $m+1$ PSI fields is used to store a value that specifies whether an effective address stored in the same entry needs translation. However, the original specification at page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 7 including table 1 discloses:

In order to support one entry in the CA 104 for a page, regardless of the page size, a page size indicator is defined for each page size supported. In FIGURE 1, three page size indicators, R1 122, R2 124 and R3 126 are defined for representing three page sizes. In this example, a bit is used as the page size indicator, however, any indicator such as a nibble, byte, word, etc. can be used as the indicator. Table 1 shows the possible combinations and meaning for each combination of the three page size indicators R1 122, R2 124, and R3 126.

TABLE 1

R1 122	R2 124	R3 126	Meaning
0	0	0	Small page size – match all three ranges (0, 1 & 2).
0	0	1	Medium page size – match range 1 and 2.
0	1	1	Large page size – match range 1.
1	1	1	No translation needed (EA = RA).

Note: All other bit combinations are invalid.

Thus, the original specification discloses at least one case in which two (i.e. "m") of the three (i.e. $m+1$) PSI fields are used to collectively store values that collectively specify one of the supported page sizes and wherein the remaining one of the three PSI fields is used to store a value that specifies whether an effective address stored in the same entry needs translation. Thus, the inventors reasonably conveyed to one skilled in the art that they had possession of the invention and submit that the rejection of Claim 6 has been overcome.

With regard to Claim 7, the Examiner apparently specified no rationale for rejecting Claim 7. Thus, the Applicants believe that Claim 7 was rejected due to its dependency from Claim 6. If this is not the case, the Applicants respectfully request appropriate clarification. Otherwise, the Applicants assert that the objection to Claim 7 has been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection of Claim 7 has been overcome and request that the rejections of Claims 6 and 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is assertedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of the amendments submitted herewith, the Applicants submit that the rejections of Claims 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §101 have been rendered moot.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133685 to Kalyanasundharam (“Kalyanasundharam”). Insofar as it may be applied against the Claims, the Applicants submit that these rejections have been rendered moot.

Claims 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Kalyanasundharam in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0204702 to Lomax et al. (“Lomax”). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, the Applicants submit that these rejections are rendered moot.

Claims 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Kalyanasundharam in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156962 to Chopra et al. (“Chopra”). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, the Applicants submit that these rejections are rendered moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claims 2, 4, and 6-7. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 are clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited

references in a patentable sense. Further, the Applicants have rewritten the subject claims to contain the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, the Applicants submit that Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 are allowable over the cited references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 be allowed.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 2, 4, and 6-7.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: July 28, 2006
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093